

03 - 11-09

3624
JRW

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited in the United States Postal Service Express Mail: EB 958939312 US, postage prepaid and addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date set forth below.

Date of Signature and Mailing: March 10, 2009

John C. Abendroth, Inventor and Applicant:



PATENT

Docket No. 100036.00002

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: John C. Abendroth, Inventor and Applicant
11225 N. Prairie View Lane
Mequon, WI 53092
(414) 517-3101 Cell Phone
E-mail: jabendroth@jcambax.com

Initial submittals by: Michael J. McGovern
Quarles & Brady, LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4497
(414) 277-5725
Prior Attorney of Record

Appl. No.: 09/751,121
Filed: December 26, 2000
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR E-COMMERCE
FREIGHT MANAGEMENT
Art Unit: 3624
Examiner: Ella Colbert
(571) 272-6741
(571) 273-8300 Organization Fax
Examiner's Supervisor: Vincent Millin
(571) 272-6747

REPLY TO THE OFFICE ACTION MAILED ON DECEMBER 10, 2008

Reply to Office Action

Appl. No.: 09/751,121 Art Unit: 3624

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Re: Filing of my response to The United States Patent and Trademark Office Action of December 10, 2008 asserting that claims 32-38, 41-46, 48-51, 57-60, and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, along with correcting the objections with respect to individual cited claims, drawings and specifications.

Sir:

This reply is in response to the Office Action by The United States Patent and Trademark Office mailed on December 10, 2008, including my completing the requested changes made to correct the improper informalities in Claims 32, 36, 41, and 46 and addressing The United States Patent and Trademark Office's responses indicating drawing figure and specification numbering irregularities or missing or inconsistent references along with Claims 32-38, 41-46, 48-51, 57-60, and 63 being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement and also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Due to the aforementioned The United States Patent and Trademark Office has considered my arguments with respect to Claims 32-68 moot in view of these new ground(s) of rejection. With the correction of the above this Reply continues to argue that my Method and System for E-Commerce Freight Management incorporating a Grand Master Bulletin Board, Master Bulletin Boards, and Bulletin Boards concept addressing freight management and products environments contains inventive steps over all of the purported prior art, reasserting my 87 page, August 11, 2008 Reply to the Office Action mailed on February 11, 2008.